

REMARKS/ARGUMENTS

Claims 1-45 and 49-65 are canceled.

Claims 46-48 are amended.

Claims 46-48 and 66-82 are pending.

Main Claim 46

#1 Communication Device Controlled Notice

As described in the text of main claim 46, when the communication device is remotely controlled via the user instruction entered by the phone, a communication device controlled notice which corresponds to the user instruction is output from the phone.

Park merely discloses as described hereinbefore the method to remotely control an automobile (Park, Fig 2 and col 3 lines 36-45, lines 62-65) and is totally silent as to the communication device controlled notice depicted in main claim 46.

Therefore, main claim 46 is patentable over Park.

Main Claim 47

#1 Controlling Communication Device Via Internet

The limitation included in main claim 47 is that the communication device is remotely controlled via the user instruction entered via the Internet.

Janssen merely discloses that cordless handset 221 implements phone calls via cellular telephone 115 by using AT commands (Janssen, Fig 3 and pars [0042]-[0044]), and does not disclose that the communication device is remotely controlled via the user instruction entered via the Internet as depicted in main claim 47.

#2 Communication Device Controlled Notice

As described in the text of main claim 47, when the communication device is remotely controlled via the user instruction entered via the Internet, a communication device controlled notice which corresponds to the user instruction is output via the Internet. Park merely discloses as described hereinbefore the method to remotely control an automobile (Park, Fig 2 and col 3 lines 36-45, lines 62-65) and is totally silent as to the communication device controlled notice depicted in main claim 47.

Kolls merely describes that an in-vehicle device 200 can data communicate to either a wireless phone 312 or an Internet appliance 322 (Kolls, Fig. 1L; col 10 lines 45-67 and col 37 lines 40-53) and is totally silent as to the communication device controlled notice depicted in main claim 47.

Janssen merely discloses that cordless handset 221 implements phone calls via cellular telephone 115 by using AT commands (Janssen, Fig 3 and pars [0042]-[0044]) and is totally silent as to the communication device controlled notice depicted in main claim 47.

Therefore, main claim 47 is patentable over Park, Kolls, and Janssen.

Main Claim 48

#1 Communication Device Controlled Notice

As described in the text of main claim 48, when the communication device is remotely controlled via the user instruction entered by the phone or via the Internet, a communication device controlled notice which corresponds to the user instruction is output from the phone or via the Internet.

Park merely discloses as described hereinbefore the method to remotely control an automobile (Park, Fig 2 and col 3 lines 36-45, lines 62-65) and is totally silent as to the communication device controlled notice depicted in main claim 48.

Therefore, main claim 48 is patentable over Park.

Sub-Claims 66-82

Sub-claims 66-82 are patentable because main claims 46-48 on which the sub-claims are dependent are patentable.

Sub-claims 66-82 are further patentable because of the limitations explained below:

Sub-claim 66 further limits that the communication device controlled notice is output and this notice indicates that the silent mode is deactivated. Park does not disclose in any way of outputting a notice indicating that the silent mode is deactivated. Besides Park does not disclose in the first place to output the result/outcome of the remote instruction.

Therefore, sub-claim 66 is patentable over Park.

Sub-claim 67 further limits that the communication device controlled notice is output and this notice indicates that audio data is output from the speaker. Park does not disclose in any why of outputting a notice indicating that audio data is output from the speaker. Besides Park does not disclose in the first place to output the result/outcome of the remote instruction.

Therefore, sub-claim 67 is patentable over Park.

Sub-claim 68 further limits that the communication device controlled notice is output and this notice indicates that the password pertaining to the communication device is changed. Huang does not disclose in any why of outputting a notice indicating that the password pertaining to the communication device is changed. Besides Huang does not disclose in the first place to output the result/outcome of the remote instruction.

Therefore, sub-claim 68 is patentable over Huang.

Sub-claim 69 further limits that the communication device controlled notice is output and this notice indicates that the communication device is locked. Park does not disclose in any why of outputting a notice indicating that the communication device is locked. Besides Park does not disclose in the first place to output the result/outcome of the remote instruction.

Therefore, sub-claim 69 is patentable over Park.

Sub-claim 70 further limits that the communication device controlled notice is output and this notice indicates that the communication device is powered off. Park does not disclose in any why of outputting a notice indicating that the communication device is powered off. Besides Park does not disclose in the first place to output the result/outcome of the remote instruction.

Therefore, sub-claim 70 is patentable over Park.

Sub-claim 71 further limits that the communication device controlled notice is output and this notice indicates that the silent mode is deactivated. Park does not disclose in any way of outputting a notice indicating that the silent mode is deactivated. Besides Park does not disclose in the first place to output the result/outcome of the remote instruction.

Osann merely describes that a mobile phone a wireless PDA communicates with a vibrating remote controller/communicator 24 which is clipped onto the user's belt (Osann, para [0057]) and does not disclose in the first place to output the result/outcome of the remote instruction.

Janssen merely discloses that cordless handset 221 implements phone calls via cellular telephone 115 by using AT commands (Janssen, Fig 3 and pars [0042]-[0044])

and does not disclose in the first place to output the result/outcome of the remote instruction.

Therefore, sub-claim 71 is patentable over Park, Osann, and Janssen.

Sub-claim 72 further limits that the communication device controlled notice is output and this notice indicates that the silent mode is deactivated. Park does not disclose in any way of outputting a notice indicating that the silent mode is deactivated. Besides Park does not disclose in the first place to output the result/outcome of the remote instruction.

Another limitation is that the communication device controlled notice indicates that audio data is output from the speaker in addition to indicating that the silent mode is deactivated. This limitation is totally foreign to Park.

Osann merely describes that a mobile phone a wireless PDA communicates with a vibrating remote controller/communicator 24 (Osann, para [0057]) and Janssen merely discloses that cordless handset 221 implements phone calls via cellular telephone 115 by using AT commands (Janssen, Fig 3 and pars [0042]-[0044]) and neither of them disclose the foregoing two limitations depicted in sub-claim 72.

Therefore, sub-claim 72 is patentable over Park.

Sub-claim 73 further limits that the communication device controlled notice is output and this notice indicates that audio data is output from the speaker. Park does not disclose in any why of outputting a notice indicating that audio data is output from the speaker. Besides Park does not disclose in the first place to output the result/outcome of the remote instruction.

Therefore, sub-claim 73 is patentable over Park.

Sub-claim 74 further limits that the communication device controlled notice is output

and this notice indicates that the password pertaining to the communication device is changed. Huang does not disclose in any why of outputting a notice indicating that the password pertaining to the communication device is changed. Besides Huang does not disclose in the first place to output the result/outcome of the remote instruction. Therefore, sub-claim 74 is patentable over Huang.

Sub-claim 75 further limits that the communication device controlled notice is output and this notice indicates that the communication device is locked. Park does not disclose in any why of outputting a notice indicating that the communication device is locked. Besides Park does not disclose in the first place to output the result/outcome of the remote instruction.

Therefore, sub-claim 75 is patentable over Park.

Sub-claim 76 further limits that the communication device controlled notice is output and this notice indicates that the communication device is powered off. Park does not disclose in any why of outputting a notice indicating that the communication device is powered off. Besides Park does not disclose in the first place to output the result/outcome of the remote instruction.

Therefore, sub-claim 76 is patentable over Park.

Sub-claim 77 further limits that the communication device controlled notice is output and this notice indicates that the silent mode is deactivated. Park does not disclose in any way of outputting a notice indicating that the silent mode is deactivated. Besides Park does not disclose in the first place to output the result/outcome of the remote instruction.

Therefore, sub-claim 77 is patentable over Park.

Sub-claim 78 further limits that the communication device controlled notice is output and this notice indicates that the silent mode is deactivated. Park does not disclose in any way of outputting a notice indicating that the silent mode is deactivated. Besides Park does not disclose in the first place to output the result/outcome of the remote instruction.

In addition, the user instruction indicates to output audio data from the speaker in addition to deactivating the silent mode. This limitation is totally foreign to Park. Further, the communication device controlled notice indicates that audio data is output from the speaker in addition to indicating that the silent mode is deactivated. This limitation is totally foreign to Park.

Therefore, sub-claim 78 is patentable over Park.

Sub-claim 79 further limits that the communication device controlled notice is output and this notice indicates that audio data is output from the speaker. Park does not disclose in any why of outputting a notice indicating that audio data is output from the speaker. Besides Park does not disclose in the first place to output the result/outcome of the remote instruction.

Therefore, sub-claim 79 is patentable over Park.

Sub-claim 80 further limits that the communication device controlled notice is output and this notice indicates that the password pertaining to the communication device is changed. Huang does not disclose in any why of outputting a notice indicating that the password pertaining to the communication device is changed. Besides Huang does not disclose in the first place to output the result/outcome of the remote instruction.

Therefore, sub-claim 80 is patentable over Huang.

Sub-claim 81 further limits that the communication device controlled notice is output

and this notice indicates that the communication device is locked. Park does not disclose in any why of outputting a notice indicating that the communication device is locked. Besides Park does not disclose in the first place to output the result/outcome of the remote instruction.

Therefore, sub-claim 81 is patentable over Park.

Sub-claim 82 further limits that the communication device controlled notice is output and this notice indicates that the communication device is powered off. Park does not disclose in any why of outputting a notice indicating that the communication device is powered off. Besides Park does not disclose in the first place to output the result/outcome of the remote instruction.

Therefore, sub-claim 82 is patentable over Park.

Conclusion

For all of the above reasons, applicant submits that the claims all define patentably over the cited prior art. Therefore, applicant submits that this application is now in condition for allowance, which action applicant respectfully solicits.

Conditional Request For Constructive Assistance

Applicant has amended the claims so that they are proper, definite, and define novel structure which is also unobvious. If, for any reason this application is not believed to be in full condition for allowance, applicant respectfully requests the constructive assistance and suggestions of the Examiner pursuant to M.P.E.P. § 2173.02 and § 707.07(j) in order that applicant can place this application in allowable condition as soon as possible and without the need for further proceedings.

Misc.

For the avoidance of doubt, each function and/or mode described in the claims presented in this amendment, if any, is capable to be implemented individually.

For the avoidance of doubt, the mode(s) and/or function(s) capable to be implemented by the communication device described in the claims presented in this amendment, if any, is/are not limited to the one(s) described in the claims, i.e., the communication device is capable to implement the mode(s) and/or function(s) other than the mode(s) and/or function(s) described in the claims.

For the avoidance of doubt, canceling the claims of this application or other applications filed by applicant or the same inventor does not indicate applicant's admission that the invention(s) described in the canceled claims is/are not patentable.

For the avoidance of doubt, abandoning this application or other applications filed by applicant or the same inventor does not indicate applicant's admission that the invention(s) described therein is/are not patentable.

Applicant has no intent to limit the scope of the claims presented in this amendment by the examples, if any, described in this amendment.

Applicant has no intent to limit the scope of the claims presented in this amendment by the previous amendment(s), if any, and/or the previous proposed amendment(s), if any, submitted by applicant or the same inventor.

Applicant has no intent to surrender any equivalent of any element included in the claims by any amendment(s), if any, and/or any proposed amendment(s), if any, whether previously or subsequently submitted to this amendment, unless expressly and unambiguously stated otherwise in the amendment(s).

Applicant has no intent to limit the scope of the claims or deny the patentability of this application by other applications filed by applicant or the same inventor.

Applicant has no intent to limit the scope of the claims or deny the patentability of other applications filed by applicant or the same inventor by this application.

For the avoidance of doubt, the number of the prior art disclosed in the IDS of this

application may be of a large one, however, applicant has no intent to hide the more relevant prior art in the less relevant ones.

For the avoidance of doubt, the number of the prior art disclosed in the IDS of other applications filed by applicant or the same inventor may be of a large one, however, applicant or the same inventor has no intent to hide the more relevant prior art in the less relevant ones.

For the avoidance of doubt, filing a terminal disclaimer for this application or other applications filed by applicant or the same inventor, if any, is not an admission that this application or other applications filed by applicant or the same inventor and the prior patent described in the terminal disclaimer are directed to substantially the same invention.

For the avoidance of doubt, any description in this application or other applications filed by applicant or the same inventor indicating that the invention provides a device capable to implement a plurality of functions where each of the plurality of functions was implemented by an individual device in the prior art merely expresses the multiple functionality of the communication device, and should not be treated as an admission of negating the patentability of the inventions described in this application or other applications filed by applicant or the same inventor, whether this description was/is/will be made in the past, present, or even in the future.

For the avoidance of doubt, the abstract of this application is illustrated in the manner for the readers to conveniently understand the image of the present invention and thereby only a portion of the subject matter of the present invention is described therein. Therefore, the scope of each claim should not be limited by the description of the abstract.

No new matter is added by this amendment.